

THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT IN GEORGE SANTAYANA AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE IDEA OF CHRIST*

By

MICHAEL MACRAKIS
B.A., M.A. in Philosophy

PART TWO

APPEAL TO THE IDEA OF CHRIST

(Ideality of the Spirit)

TRANSITION TO THE SECOND PART

(The Sense in Which We Use the Term
«Application» as a Mediating Link between
the Two Parts of This Treatise)

This image [of Christ] essentially represents a mystery, the mystery of God-in-man; so that it possesses a double interest for the philosopher; first, as an important figure in the history of religion and art, and then as a symbol for the high moral and ontological mysteries which it personifies (ICG, 17).

As the first part of this essay was based in the main on *The Realms of Being*, and especially on *The Realm of Spirit*, so the second part will be based mainly on *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels or God in Man*. This part, therefore, as an appeal to the idea of Christ exhibited in the above book concerns our subject from the religious point of view as Santayana, of course, understands religion, that is, in its relation to art or poetry. The image of Christ, as he explains, interests the philosopher «first,

* Continuation from *Theologia*, No 47, October - December 1976, p. 789.

as an important figure in the history of religion and art» (ICG,17). For this reason, before we begin our treatment of the application of the life of spirit to the idea of Christ, let us see in general Santayana's attitude towards religion as a spiritual value besides those of philosophy and art. This will help us to understand better the sense in which we use here the term of «application» as a mediating link between the two parts of this essay.

As Nic. Louvaris, Professor of the Athens University, remarks:

The most essential content of the spiritual life is, besides philosophy, religion and art, too. All these are highest manifestations of the nature of man, and the unity of the human soul presupposes a very close connection of them as is evident in history¹.

In analogy, then, to philosophy, art, and religion, as Louvaris further remarks:

The philosophical impulse is manifested in the history of philosophy in three ways depending on which of the three faculties of the soul (reason, feeling, will) is used in the first place for its satisfaction. In the first case we have the scientific philosopher, in the second the artistic philosopher, and in the third the prophetic philosopher. An example of the first type is Aristotle, an example of the second is Plato, and an example of the third is Pythagoras²,

Louvaris makes this distinction of the three philosophical types in the second volume of his *History of Philosophy*, and exactly in the section concerning F. Nietzsche who, according to the writer, belongs to all these types of philosopher. Besides the German philosopher, the American philosopher, George Santayana, though he differs so greatly from the prophet of «superman», belongs also to the group of those philosophers who combine in their life and philosophy the three above mentioned philosophical types. He is first a scientific philosopher in his search of the truth; as a poet, he is then an artistic philosopher³ in his interest in beauty; and, finally, he is a religious or moral philosopher in his longing for the good.

1. Νικ. Λούβαρι: *Ίστορία τῆς φιλοσοφίας* (History of Philosophy), 'Αθήναι, ἔκδ. Ἐλευθερουδάκη, 1933, Vol. I, p. 12.

2. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 125.

3. R. Butler, for example, says about Santayana as poet-philosopher the following: «Santayana was a poet before he was a philosopher, and his philosophy has retained poetic expression...» (*The Mind of Santayana*, p. 57).

In his «General Review of *Realms of Being*» he says, of course, that «my philosophy neither is nor wishes to be scientific» (RS, 273). But, when I attribute to him the characteristic of «scientific», I mean that reason or logic in Santayana as in every philosopher is basic. «As for me», he says, «I aspire to be a rational animal rather than a pure spirit»⁴. These words led Sterling P. Lamprecht to conclude that «Santayana does at least recognize that the spiritual life falls within the life of reason»⁵. So, in saying that «my philosophy neither is nor wishes to be scientific», Santayana means that his philosophy is not strictly scientific or only scientific; for if his philosophy were in a strict sense scientific, then Santayana would be a scientist and not a real philosopher or at least he would be a philosopher as the followers of «Logical Positivism» understand the philosopher today, that is, a philosopher who uses logic only as every scientist does.

In opposition to this kind of modern philosopher, Santayana says that «my philosophy is like that of the ancients a discipline of the mind and heart, a lay religion» (RS, 273). Santayana's temperament is religious and remained so through his whole life. The religious or mystic elements in his nature are inherited by him from the traditions and the religious beliefs of his fatherland, Spain, which as David Pubio says, «has a soul: it is *mystic*, fundamentally mystic»⁶. These elements which were more obvious in the first, the pre-rationalistic or romantic period of his life, could not disappear in later years in spite of his materialism⁷. So, it is not strange that we hear from his mouth the following confession which seems to conflict with his naturalism: «Without any pretense

4. RE, 65. One can see the importance of reason in Santayana's philosophy especially in his four-volume work, *The Life of Reason*.

5. See the essay, «Animal Faith and the Art of Intuition in the Philosophy of Santayana», in the *Library of Living Philosophers: The Philosophy of G. Santayana*, Vol. II, p. 120.

6. David Pubio, *The Mystic Soul of Spain*, Cosmopolitan, New York, Science and Art Service, Co., Inc., 1946, pp. 9-10.

7. As R. Butler remarks, «in his youth, Santayana had bewailed poetically the loss of the glorious ideals of supernatural faith. Later on, however, he developed a compromise by which these ideals might be retained while thoroughly naturalized. But they had to be uprooted from the existential order and transformed into pure ideals, logical forms unrealizable except as purely mental goals. Thus he sought the fruits of religious experience without the dogmas of a supernatural faith. His morality, then, would be purely natural...» (*The Mind of Santayana*, p. 121). Thus even in the later years of his life «the religious motif becomes apparent, and Santayana proceeds to appropriate the terms of Christian dogma and morality and apply them to his own naturalistic doctrine» (*Ibid.*, p. 122).

to be religious or mystical I find myself daily in that case» (RE, 156).

Only when we consider Santayana's religious character can we understand his great interest in «the idea of God-in-man, that religious image of Christ evoked in the Gospels and living in the Christian mind» (ICG, 6), which is his subject in *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels*, «dwelling only on the idea of the divine in man, as exemplified in the Person of Jesus Christ—a Person, however, poetically inspired and expressing in myth the naturalism that Santayana himself proposes»⁸. Santayana himself talks about «the legend of Christ» (RS, 203; also ICG, 13, 14, 21, 104, 134). So, to him applies also what David F. Strauss said about those interpreters of his times who, «in adopting the mythical point of view as hitherto applied to Biblical history», belong among those who «had again approximated to the ancient allegorical interpretation»⁹.

Concerning the distinction between the historical and the ideal and the significance of the allegorical or symbolical in comparison to the literal interpretation, Santayana says the following in his *Interpretations of Poetry and Religion*:

Let not the reader fancy that in Christianity everything was settled by records and traditions. The idea of Christ himself had to be constructed by the imagination in response to moral demands, tradition giving only the barest external points of attachment. The facts were nothing until they became symbols; and nothing could turn them into symbols except an eager imagination on the watch for all that might embody its dreams.— The crucifixion, for example, would remain a tragic incident without further significance, if we regard it merely as a historical fact; to make it a religious mystery, an idea capable of converting the world, the moral imagination must transform it into something that happens for the sake of the soul, so that each believer may say to himself that Christ so suffered for the love of him. And such a thought is surely the objectification of an inner impulse; the idea of Christ becomes something spiritual, something poetical... Thus the central fact of all Christ's history, narrated by every Evangelist, could still be nothing but a painful incident, as unessential to the Christian religion as the death of Socrates to the Socratic philosophy, were it not transformed by the imagination of the believer into the counterpart of his own moral need. Then, by ceasing to

8. *Ibid.*, p. 126.

9. David Friedrich Strauss, *The Life of Jesus*; tr. by George Eliot, London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., New York, Macmillan and Co., 1892, Introduction sec. 12, p. 65. See also, on the same page, about the similarities and differences of the mythical and allegorical interpretations in general, according to Strauss.

be viewed as a historical fact, the death of Christ becomes a religious inspiration (IPR, 92-94).

As we can see then from the above long quotation, the important thing for Santayana in his interpretation of the idea of Christ is not the historical facts as such but these facts as «symbols of moral truth». Considering this, we can understand why in his book, *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels*, his «object is not to pass judgment on the validity of the Gospel truth, either historical or metaphysical» (ICG, 10). Besides the validity of historical facts, Santayana does not judge also the validity of metaphysical elements in the Gospels, such as the miracles, and especially the greatest of them, the Resurrection (ICG, 159), which concern the divinity of Christ (ICG, 81, 84). The Christian dogma of the two natures of Christ, the divine (the Son of God) and the human (the Son of Man), are important for Santayana only as symbolizing the two natures of the soul, the «divine spirit» and the «human psyche». This distinction between spirit and psyche, which is very important in order to understand the moral struggle between spirit and flesh within man in a real sense and the union of God with man in a symbolic sense, constitutes the basis of Santayana's interpretation of the idea of Christ as God-in-Man.

From what we said in particular about the idea of Christ as a symbol, we can understand that Santayana is interested in the Christian doctrine in general not as a history but as a poetry for «the whole of Christian doctrine is religious and efficacious only when it becomes poetry»¹⁰. The single idea of the *Interpretations of Poetry and Religion*,

10. IPR, 94. Concerning Christianity as poetry, distinguished from history, it is interesting to compare Santayana's view with that of Horst, which Strauss gives in his book, *The Life of Jesus*, Conclusion, sec. 149, p. 776: «At an earlier period Horst presented this symbolical view of the history of Jesus with singular clearness. Whether, he says, all that is narrated of Christ happened precisely so, historically, is a question indifferent to us, nor can it now be settled. Nay, if we would be candid with ourselves, that which was once sacred history for the Christian believer, is, for the enlightened portion of our contemporaries, only fable: the narratives of the supernatural birth of Christ, of his miracles, of his resurrection and ascension, must be rejected by us as at variance with the inductions of our intellect. Let them however only be no longer interpreted merely by the understanding as history, but by the feeling and imagination, as poetry; and it will be found that in these narratives nothing is invented arbitrarily, but all springs from the depths and divine impulses of the human mind. Considered from this point of view, we may annex to the history of Christ all that is important to religious trust, animating to the pure dispositions, attractive to the tender feelings. That history is a beautiful, sacred poem

as Santayana explains in the beginning of his preface to this book, is that «religion and poetry are indetical in essence, and differ merely in the way in which they are attached to practical affairs» (IPR, v). So, according to this identity in essence, religion has a poetic nature, as also, on the other hand, «poetry has a universal and a moral function» (IPR, vi). This «moral function of the imagination and the poetic nature of religion form the theme» (IPR, x) of Santayana's *Interpretations of Poetry and Religion*.

This theme of the above book¹¹ in consideration of the subject of *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels or God in Man* can explain in general the sense in which we use the term «application» in the title of our essay: *The Life of the Spirit in George Santayana and Its Application to the Idea of Christ*, a subject, however, which, we must acknowledge here, is not an inspiration of ours but of Santayana's himself who towards the end of *The Realm of Spirit* makes an «Appeal to the Idea of Christ»¹². When Santayana was writing this book about Spirit, he had already in his mind the idea of Christ which he later developed in his book on this subject in which he showed in more detail the application of the life of spirit to this idea¹³. Considering, then, this application of *The Realm of*

of the human race—a poem in which are embodied all the wants of our religious instinct; and this is the highest honour of Christianity, and the strongest proof of its universal applicability. The history of the gospel is in fact the history of human nature conceived ideally, and exhibits to us in the life of an individual, what man ought to be, and, united with him by following his doctrine and example, can actually become. It is not denied that what to us can appear only sacred poetry, was to Paul, John, Matthew and Luke, fact and certain history. But it was the very same internal cause which made the narratives of the gospel sacred fact and history to them, which makes those narratives to us a sacred mythus and poetry...».

11. This theme, as set forth by Santayana in his *Interpretations of Poetry and Religion*, is, according to R. Butler, the following: «Religion, presumed to have its source in divine revelation, is merely a symbolic expression of naturalistic ideas» (*The Mind of Santayana*, p. 127). *The Interpretation* is regarded by Santayana himself as the keynote of his philosophy for religion. He says: «It is true that, as to religion, this book had struck the keynote» (*The Mind of Santayana*, p. 191).

12. This is the title of a paragraph in the eighth chapter of *The Realm of Spirit* (p. 202). This paragraph-title: «Appeal to the person of Christ as conceived by the Church» could be also the title of the second half of the eighth chapter entitled in general «Liberation».

13. Only six years separate *The Realm of Spirit* from *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels*, the former written in 1940, the latter in 1946. That Santayana had in his mind the idea of Christ many years before he started to write the book is evident from the following words he said to Herbert Schneider who met the former in Rome during the winter of 1926: «I think I'd like to write a life of Christ before I die; and

Spirit to the Idea of Christ in the Gospels in the light of the *Interpretations of Poetry and Religion*, it is understood that we could use in the case of the title of our subject, instead of «application» or «appeal», as Santayana prefers, the more explicative term «symbolism» or «poetic interpretation» of the moral life of spirit by the idea of Christ, for this idea is the «symbol for that reality» (ICG, 8) of the spirit.

This sense in which we use the term «application» can also explain in general the meaning of each of the two parts in which we divide our subject: Part One, The Life of the Spirit (Reality of the Spirit); and Part Two, The Idea of Christ (Ideality of the Spirit).

if I do, I'll start the life of Christ with the Mount of Transfiguration; that's where it begins». As Schneider remarks on these words of Santayana, «he did a little of that in his *Idea of Christ in the Gospels*. But that idea he played with for many years, I know» (*Dialogue on Santayana*; ed. by Corliss Lamont, New York, Horizon Press, 1959, p. 61; see also pp. 56-57).

CHAPTER I

ANALOGY BETWEEN SANTAYANA'S ONTOLOGY
AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

Seen in another light, religiously rather than cosmologically, my treatment of [the] four realms of being may be regarded as a reduction of Christian theology and spiritual discipline to their secret interior source. In particular my analysis transposes the doctrine of the Trinity into terms of pure ontology and moral dialectic (RS, 291).

30. The Correspondence of the Realm of Matter to the Father in the Doctrine of the Trinity.

Our conclusion of the first part concerned an actual and existent Good, the Good for Santayana, contrasted to that potential and non-existent Good of the Mystics and the Indians. In other words, the Good, according to Santayana, in order to be really good must exist, otherwise it cannot be good. It is this conclusion that makes him separate the Good in his moral system from pure Being or God of Christian Mysticism and Brahmanism because this pure Being or God does not exist for Santayana.

Santayana does not believe in God as a transcendent power or as identical with Nature. «Pure Being», he says in his *Realm of essence*, «is not an existence or a power, therefore not the God of theism or of pantheism» (RE, 58). And in *The Realm of Spirit* he says also: «Pure Being is not identified by myself with the idea of God... It cannot be a living God; yet unless the idea God somehow included pure Being it would remain a wholly mythical poetic idea without philosophic or rational warrant» (RS, 383) because, as he explains in *The Realm of Matter*, any-

one who thinks of spirits as powers, [they] are simply mythological names for certain operations of matter... Human spirits are such mythological units;... and God is such a mythological name for the universal power and operation of matter¹. From this point of view, as Santayana says, he is an atheist. Santayana is a materialist. «God», for him, «conceived merely as a power, would become *identical with matter*, the omnificent substance and force of everything» (RS, 284). Matter, therefore, «is symbolized under the name of God» (RM, 205).

Not only God as power and the source of everything or rather God as our Father, who is «the source of our being» in general» (ICG, 195), but also God as the Father of Christ in particular is a symbolic name for matter. From this point of view, therefore, Santayana finds a similarity of the realm of matter, as also of the other realms of being, with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, an «analogy between [his] ontology and the doctrine of the Trinity» (RS, 291). At the end of his «General Review of *Realms of Being*», which may be regarded as a transition to the symbolic interpretation of the realm of spirit by *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels*, he says:

Seen in another light, religiously rather than cosmologically, my treatment of these four realms of being may be regarded as a reduction of Christian theology and spiritual discipline to their secret interior source. In particular my analysis transposes the doctrine of the Trinity into terms of pure ontology and moral dialectic (RS, 291). This analogy between Christian theology and my ontology must not be pressed: the one is a dogma, the other a language: a language based not on inspiration but on analysis, and meant only to render articulate the dumb experience of the soul. I am not concerned in these *Realms of Being* with alleged separate substances or independent regions. I am endeavouring only to distinguish the *types* of reality that I encounter; and the lines of cleavage that I discern are moral and logical, not physical, chasms (RS, 299).

Considering in general the analogy between the realms of being and the doctrine of the Trinity, which is the subject of this chapter, the first chapter of the second part of our essay, we can also understand the correspondence of this chapter to the first chapter (of the first part) concerning the realms of being in general and the place of the realm of spirit among them in particular. But, let us see here, according to San-

1. RM, 171. See also PP, 128-129 where he talks of God as a myth in reference to *The Realms of Being*.

tayana, to which of the Three Persons of the Trinity each of these realms of being corresponds.

Concerning the First Person of the Trinity, the Father, Santayana says:

«The Father» represents the realm of matter, where the sun shines on the just and on the unjust, where to him that hath shall be given, where the lilies of the field flourish and the sparrows fall, where the house built on a rock will stand (for a reason), where the poor are always with us, and where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth².

By «matter or the realm of matter» Santayana understands «the very power by which the world was created» (RS, 207), «the universal power» (RS, 206), «the assault of reality, in the force of whatsoever exists or happens» (RS, 292). «But evidently», as Santayana explains, «the very power is signified by the First Person of the Trinity, the Father, almighty creator of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible» (RS, 292). Thus «matter, or primordial substance and power, corresponds to the Father» (RS, 291).

21. The Correspondence of the Realm of Essence to the Son and of the Realm of Truth to the Logos or the Word.

The First Person of the Trinity has to do with the realm of matter. But, what about the second Person, the Son? To which of the realms of being does it correspond?

Since «all things, according to the Nicene creed, were perforce created through the Son» (RS, 292), it becomes clear, Santayana remarks, that

2. RS, 204. In this passage Santayana uses different pictures taken from the teaching of Christ in the Gospels. Compare, for example, with the passages: «He [The Father] maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust» (Matt. 5:45); «Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow...» (Matt. 6: 28, Luke 12:27); «Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father» (Matt. 10:29, Luke 12:6); «Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock» (Matt. 7:24, Luke 6:48), etc. (All passages from the New Testament are taken from the King James version).

Power could not possibly produce anything unless it borrowed some form from the realm of essence and imposed that form on itself and on its works... The Son is thus an indispensable partner and vehicle for the life of the Father (RS, 292). If we interpret in this way the Father to be power and the Son to be form, we see at once how the essence or quality of each is independent and incomparable, while their existence is one and inseparable. To exercise power is to select and adopt form: by which selection or adoption power ceases to be a merely explosive and empty strain, and form ceases to be an infinite indiscriminated field of possibilities (RS, 293). [This] selective fiat of power limits actual form to the Logos or the truth (RS, 293). The Logos is only a selection from the realm of essence (RS, 294).

Speaking of the Logos, Santayana understands, of course, the Second Person of the Trinity, Christ, whom St. John in the beginning of his Gospel characterizes as the «Word» (John 1:1-5,14; also ICG, 30-32, 64-65), which is the English translation of the Greek *Λόγος* (Logos). The immediate source of this notion is the Neo-Platonic philosopher, Philo Judaeus, and the Alexandrian Jewish School of Wisdom which Wisdom or Sophia (Gr. *σοφία* = wisdom) together with Logos «had become, in this school», according to Santayana, «aspects or emanations of the Deity» (ICG, 30).

Considering the symbolism of form or essence that Santayana associated before with the name of Christ, we can understand why he relates now the same realm to the Logos or the Word, that is, with «Christ identified with the Logos» (ICG, 31). He says:

A word is not an existing substance or force, apart from the tongue and the mind that utter it: it is the form that the mind and the vocal organs must adopt if they are to utter anything in particular. Logos was therefore an appropriate term for the Platonists to adopt in describing the creation; for each idea or essence, by being embodied in matter, turned that parcel of matter into a distinct and recognisable thing (ICG, 31). For definite things arise by assuming a specific form or essence, by beginning to exemplify some distinct character; and the field of these characters, with their essential relations, is the eternal Logos (ICG, 30-31). This complex or series of forms exemplified in the universe composes the truth about it; and this is the side of reality approachable by the intellect. It is the Logos, comparable with the heaven of Platonic Ideas... This is just as much God as is the Father, since power or substance cannot exist without form. But form also cannot exist without substance and power to extricate it from infinity and render it actual; so that the Father and the Son

are not two separable existents, but two incommensurable and equally original features of existence itself (RS, 292)³.

Of course, the Father as representing the realm of matter which is the source of everything that exists has a priority, but this «priority of substance indicated by the name Father», as Santayana explains, «appears only on the naturalistic side» (RS, 293). «In deity», however, «or in the universe seen under the form of eternity», he accepts that «the Logos [the Son] is as primitive as the Will [the Father]» (RS, 294). So, Santayana repeats with St. John: «In the beginning the Word was with God» (RS, 293).

22. The Correspondence of the Realm of Spirit to the Holy Ghost (Inspiration, Like Spirit Itself, in Santayana Not Supernatural from Outside but Natural from Within).

After the symbolism of the realm of matter by the First Person of the Trinity and the realm of essence and of truth by the Second Person, what remains for Santayana is to symbolize the last realm of being by the Third Person of the Trinity. «This third dimension of reality is spirit» which arises «when matter and form, by a contingent fusion, have themselves become actual» (RS, 294). «As matter can *exist* only in some form, and form only in some matter, so spirit can *exist* only incarnate in the flux of matter and form, where nothing is stable or is perfect, if perfect at all, for more than a moment» (RS, 297). «Spirit proceeds, it is always proceeding, from the Father and from the Son» (RS, 297)⁴. In other words, «the Holy Ghost is not the first person of the Trinity, but the third, proceeding both from the Father and from the Son. Consciousness is a gift of nature, happiness is a fruit of piety and order; and spirit, being the final fruition of existence, absolutely needs the other realms to evoke and to feed it» (RS, 298).

3. RS, 293. Concerning the Logos and Plato, John P. Potter remarks: «The *Logos* of Plato, taken in its simplicity, is and true and noble conception, which, having distinguished mind from matter, elevates mind above matter» (*The Mysticism of Plato*, London, R. Hunter, MDCCCXXXII, p. 43).

4. This is an adaptation to Santayana's naturalism of the *filiogue* of the Catholic Church but not of the Greek Orthodox Church which holds that the Holy Ghost proceeds only from the Father and not from the Son, too. However, Santayana, as a Catholic by tradition, has in view the Catholic belief, that is, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

So, as Santayana points out, «the *source* of spirit itself lies in the Father and the Son, or in my language in matter organised into the form of a psyche» (RS, 295-296). In other words, «genetically, nature must come first and spirit afterwards» (ICG, 50). But, «spirit, for all its dependence, is no less divine than are form [the Son] and power [the Father], and integral to reality. For... like essence and truth, spirit has its own supremacy. It is original and morally prior in its sphere, and necessary to the perfection of those elements from which it flows» (RS, 296). For «the spirit *gives* life in the sense that life would nowhere be morally worthy of the name if spirit were not actual there» (RS, 295).

According to the seventh article of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed⁵, the article which refers to the Third Person of the Trinity, it is the Holy Ghost that «spoke by the Prophets» (τὸ λαλήσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν), or, as Santayana says, «by all voices inspired by power and by truth» (RS, 296; also 295). This inspiration, then, which qualifies men to receive and communicate power and truth and which «marks the birth of spirit» (ICG, 7) which «exists in multitudinous inspirations» (RS 299), characterizes also, according to Santayana, the Evangelists who «drew their inspiration from that unexpected interpretation of the prophets» (ICG, 171), for «the idea of Christ in the Gospels, when completely developed remains true in outline to the original prophecies of a Messiah» (ICG, 53). «Inspiration», he says, «is pictorial and prophetic. We find it at its height in the Hebrew prophets and in the Gospels» (ICG, 7).

About this inspiration in the Gospels Santayana talks especially in the first (introductory) chapter to *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels*. And, as we can see from what he says at the end of this chapter, the main questions of the book concern inspiration. «What exactly is this inspiration as enshrined in the Gospels? And what, in fact, is the predicament that it expresses? Such are the questions that I endeavour to answer in the following pages» (ICG, 19).

But our question about Santayana as concerns inspiration is: Does he accept inspiration as this term is especially used in theology, that is, as the condition of being directly under a supernatural or divine influence, in which sense inspiration is the equivalent of the Greek

5. As is known, the first seven articles referring to the Father and the Son were decreed in Nicene (325 A.D.) by the First Ecumenical Council, while the last five articles referring to the Holy Ghost, etc. were decreed in Constantinople (381 A.D.) by the Second Ecumenical Council.

θεόπνευστία (2 Timothy 3:16)? In this passage of St. Paul θεόπνευστος means «inspired by God» and in this sense, as Santayana points out, «inspiration, as the etymology of the word indicates, was originally conceived to be influenced from without. For this reason, it was expected to be literally true» (ICG, 16). But, Santayana himself, in opposition to «the belief that any inspiration comes from outside», holds that «inspiration, in proportion to its vital force and significance, comes from the depths of the heart» (ICG, 236). As intellect which is «internal to the psyche and potential there, just as the psyche itself is internal and potential to the organism» (ICG, 235), so the source of inspiration is inner (ICG, 8). «The graphic and persuasive force of inspiration», says Santayana, «although circumstances may be propitious for it, as they may be propitious for the development of a seed, does not invade us from outside, but on the contrary springs from an innate poetic fertility and suppressed dreamfulness in the psyche» (ICG, 7). For this reason, Santayana explains, «it may seem to follow from this view that no inspiration can be *literally* true, since all are figments of the psyche and at best reveal external facts only symbolically» (ICG, 9).

23. Spirit Incarnate or God in Man as the Main Subject in Santayana's *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels*

Considering the above view of Santayana's as concerns inspiration, we can understand why in the idea of Christ he follows not the literal but the symbolic mode of interpretation such, for example, as we saw before in the case of the doctrine of the Trinity by which Santayana symbolizes his ontology, and exactly the realm of matter by the Father, the realms of essence and of truth by the Son, and the realm of spirit by the Holy Ghost⁶. But, considering the latter, the symbolizing of spirit by the Holy Ghost, a question arises here as concerns the Person of Christ and its relation to the spirit: Since in this analogy between Santayana's ontology and the doctrine of the Trinity spirit corresponds to

6. In view of this divine Trinity Santayana talks also of a «human Trinity in genuine humanity» (ICG, 151). This is the «human Trinity in Calvary» (ICG, 152) where «stood by the cross of Jesus his mother» and «the disciple» «whom he loved» (John 19:25, 26). According to Santayana's interpretation of this human Trinity, «in Christ, God dwells absolutely, his person being essentially divine» (ICG, 151), «in Mary there is only human nature» (ICG, 151), and «in John, God is in him in the natural form of inspiration» (ICG, 152).

the Holy Ghost, in what sense then can we talk of the application of the life of spirit to the idea of Christ which is our subject?

According to the Nicene creed, the Three Persons of the Trinity are characterized by sameness in essence or substance (*ὁμοούσιον*)⁷ and by equality in power. This sameness and equality of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost protects the Oneness of the Trinity against polytheism. In other words, though these Three Persons are distinguished as persons themselves, they are identified at the same time as one God, for each of them involves absolutely the two others, too. To speak in the language of Santayana «the Logos [The Son] is as primitive as the Will [the Father]» (RS, 294), as also the «spirit, for all its dependence, is no less divine than are form [the Son] and power [the Father]» because «spirit has its own supremacy. It is original and morally prior in its sphere» (RS, 296). «This spirit speaks by all prophets, that is, by all voices inspired by power and by truth: an utterance which is itself the ultimate manifestation of power, and the first pure and non-material actualization of form. So that it is in the Holy Ghost that the Father and the Son are first truly vivified and united and adored and glorify one another» (RS, 296). For this reason, «the Father and the Son were accordingly conceived to be spirits on their own account» (RS, 295).

On the other hand, Christ as the Son of God, is, like the Father, God, too, «God walking on earth as he had walked in the garden of Eden in the cool of the evening»⁸. As the Son is involved in the Father so He is also involved in the Holy Ghost. For this reason, according to Santayana, «St. Paul often speaks of 'Christ' and of the 'Spirit' indifferently as dwelling within him» (RS, 296), for «Christ and the Holy Spirit are felt as forces at work within us, as the transforming grace of God: and the historical, legendary, and ontological questions about Jesus and about the Trinity disappear or can be easily solved» (ICG, 59).

Thus, the correspondence, that Santayana found before, between the Second Person of the Trinity and the realm of essence is something

7. See the second article of this creed: *ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο* (consubstantial with the Father, through whom all things were made).

8. ICG, 59. Santayana has in view here the passage from *Genesis* 3:8: «God walking in the garden about the breezy part of the day». These words can refer to God as the Father and as the Son, the latter appearing more explicitly however in the creation as the Word of God by which the world was made, for «God said» (or book went on to say) and «it was so» (or it came to be so) (See the first chapter of the of *Genesis*). Similarly, Santayana, speaking of Christ as walking like God, in the Garden of Eden, considers the Son as involved, according to the doctrine of the Trinity, in the Father.

which concerns, according to him, the Son of God who «pre-existed in heaven » (ICG, 44) and not the Son of God who was «sent down», and became also the Son of Man δι' ἐπελεύσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος (Luke 1:35), by the Holy Ghost which came upon the Virgin Mary. This incarnation of Christ, for Santayana, is not an incarnation of the Word *by* the Holy Ghost but an incarnation *of* the Holy Ghost itself. In other words, it is an incarnation of the Third and not of the Second Person of the Trinity.

It is evident, then, that on this point Santayana does not agree with the doctrine of the Church. According to this doctrine, though all the Persons of the Trinity participate in the incarnation of Christ, it is the Second Person or the Word that is made incarnate in him. Santayana's opinion, therefore, is different in thinking that the «divine element especially incarnate in human existence is spirit; not that matter or essence can be wanting, but that the novel fact and great characteristic here is the passion of Christ» (RS, 297). For this reason, as he explains, «Christ was supreme spirit incarnate in a human creature, suffering and dying guiltlessly in that creature» (RS, 203).

So, in opposition to the doctrine of the Church, which follows St. John's saying «the Word was made flesh» (John 1:14), Santayana accepts that Christ is spirit incarnate, rather than the Word. He says:

I cannot help thinking that it was an unfortunate accident that the *Son* of God and the *Wisdom* of God should have seemed to coincide, as being both immediately and inwardly generated within the divine life, and thought of as its second term. That divine element which seems to descend into the created soul is rather life than wisdom, rather the Psyche than the Logos; but something of the Logos may descend too, and we find in *John* a number of other terms, the Light, the Way, the Truth, that fall in well with the mediating office of Christ, as teacher and redeemer. Yet there are still other terms, Life and Love, that seem to fit better the intimate essence of his person, as if he were the Spirit incarnate, rather than the Word (ICG, 31-32).

This «spirit incarnate», then, identified with the idea of Christ (ICG, 86, 105, 171) or «the idea of God in man» (ICG, 18: also 73) is Santayana's main subject (ICG, 6, 133) in his book *The Idea of Christ in the Gospels or God in Man*. In our interpretation, therefore, of this idea an important thing to keep always in mind, as we shall proceed through this whole part, the second part of our essay, based mainly on this book of Santayan's, is that Christ is not the Word but the Spirit incarnate; for it is on this basis that we can understand the sense in which the life of spirit applies to the idea of Christ which is our subject.

CHAPTER II

THE GENERATION AND THE BIRTH OF CHRIST

He [Christ] was the Son of God in a sense not so much literal as superlative. As he had had no father on earth, he had had no mother in heaven, but was born miraculously and perpetually from the divine substance like Athena (who also represented wisdom), from the brain of Zeus. This mystery was ultimately defined in the Nicene Creed by declaring that Christ was begotten, not made: a most pregnant pronouncement that, at the roots of being, substitutes the principle of generation for that creation (ICG, 195-196).

24. Generation and Dependence of Christ
(The Heavenly Father of Christ)

Christ as a supreme Spirit incarnate in a human creature has to do with his birth from an earthly mother, the Virgin Mary, who is called by the Church *Θεομήτωρ* (*Θεοῦ Μητέρα*), that is, Mother of God, for she bore Christ who is God. Christ is God because he is the Son of God and the «son of God must be as much God as the father» (ICG, 54). So, though Christ's mother is earthly, his father is divine, for Christ as the Son of God has as Father God himself who, according to the Nicene creed *generates* the Son. Considering in general that «generation and birth *separate* the offspring from the parents» (ICG, 65), we can understand how this chapter, which treats the Parents of Christ (his *generation* from the Father and his *birth* from the Mother), corresponds to the second chapter (of the first part) concerning the «Origin and Birth of the Spirit» (The Parents of the Spirit). But, let us see in more detail this correspondence by the treatment of the Parents of Christ in this chapter.

a. *The Father of Christ (The Fatherhood of God in Relation to His Only-Begotten Son and in Relation to Us)*. We said that the Father of Christ is God himself. This, especially in the case of Christ, must not be understood, of course, in the sense in which God is also the Father of all men in general. Concerning the «Fatherhood of God» (ICG, Pt. II, ch. iv), Santayana remarks:

In the Old Testament the name of Father is hardly ever given to God, although it is a natural poetic variant on the names of Creator and Lord. It is used spontaneously in other religions when the feeling of kinship with our sources and our surroundings becomes vivid; for a father is a source of our being that, unlike the ambient elements, wears our own form and species... In the New Testament, however, Christ not only continually calls God his Father, but teaches his disciples to call him so (ICG, 193).

We can see this teaching of Christ, for example, in the prayer he gave to his disciples, the Lord's Prayer, according to which, God is our «Father who is in heaven» (Matt. 6:9; Luke 11:2) and who «makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust» (Matt. 5:45).

Referring again and again to these words of Christ (RS, 204, ICG, 115, 227, etc.), Santayana converts them in his own philosophy in such a way as to mean by the title «God the Father» «nature» which «is normally neutral» (ICG, 96) or «the hard economy of nature, where the sun shines on the just and on the unjust» (ICG, 205). So, «fatherhood in nature, biological fatherhood, by no means involves the protection and indulgence that the poetry of home lends to the word 'father'» (ICG, 199).

This symbolizing of nature by God as a Father is made by Santayana because matter is the real potentiality of everything. He says:

Matter is full of potentiality. Everything seems to arise, or to threaten to arise, that can do so, and whatever circumstances permit at any point becomes actual here. We are planted, we are fostered; like the lilies of the field and the sparrows, some of us at least for a season find nourishment and protection enough to exist and to grow into what it was in us to be (ICG, 198).

So, «matter» as «the source of everything» (RM, 164, 171, 186-187, 196) or «the dominant power—call it God, fate, or matter» (ICG, 122) by «the representation of God as an absolute monarch, or a living father, is obviously mythical» (ICG, 101). In this sense, therefore, «God is the father of all things, not of men only» (ICG, 53).

Now, as God as the source of everything is the father of all things and of all men in a general sense, so he is the Father of Christ in a particular sense. And it is this particularity of the sonship of Christ that characterizes him, according to the Nicene Creed, as the «only-begotten Son of God»¹, for «Christ, according to the unanimous conviction of the Evangelists, was the son of God in a mysterious, supernatural sense» (ICG, 53). As Santayana explains, «he was the Son of God in a sense not so much literal as superlative» (ICG, 195-196). In other words, Christ's relation to God was «congenital and eternal sonship» (ICG, 196). Concerning this eternal relation of the Father to the Son, Santayana remarks:

The metaphor by which the eternal relation of the first to the second person of the Trinity is called a relation of Father to Son would be based on this personal identity of the second person with the human Christ. Christ had a mother, and it was natural that, orphaned as he was of an earthly father, and an exile in the world, he should have given the name of Father to his essential source in the eternal sphere (ICG, 57).

Our relation, therefore, to God as a Father is different from that of Christ who is the real Son of God, «the son of God in a most real and exceptional sense» (ICG, 57), for «we have not, like the Son of God, a single and changeless parent» (ICG, 145). In a human being «the child is destined some day to be a father» (ICG, 54). «But in *eternal* being, if there be a relation comparable to that between father and son, that contrast and generation must itself be perpetual. The Father will never have been a son; the Son will never become a father... The Father is forever and constitutionally a father, and the Son is constitutionally and forever a son» (ICG, 63).

b. Generation and Procession of Christ from the Father (The origin of Spirit from Matter). The difference of sonship in an eternal being and in a human being is expressed by the Nicene Creed in the second article, concerning the person of Christ, as follows:

And [I believe] in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all Ages. Light of Light, Very God of Very God, begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father, through Whom all things were made.

Commenting on this article Santayana says:

1. See the second article of the Nicene Creed; also John 1: 14,18.

This mystery [the miraculous and perpetual birth of Christ from the divine substance] was ultimately defined in the Nicene Creed by declaring that Christ was begotten, not made: a most pregnant pronouncement that, at the roots of being, substitutes the principles of generation for that of creation (ICG, 196).

The difference, therefore, of the sonship in eternal being (Christ's sonship) from that in human being (our sonship) is expressed by these two participles: *begotten not made*, that is, generated not created. Of this generation of the Son from the Father, Santayana says:

Seen as an emanation of the deity such generation could not be an event with a date; it would signify only an *essential* derivation of one person or hypothesis from the other, as the corollaries of a proposition flow essentially from that proposition (ICG, 57). That the Son is derived from the Father is implied by that title (ICG, 37).

In *The Realm of Spirit*, where Santayana characterizes Christ as a «supreme spirit incarnate in a human creature» (RS, 203), he says also that «He [the Father] generates and inspires it [the Spirit, that is, Christ]» (RS, 204).

Concerning this generation of the Spirit in a particular sense (Christ) in comparison to the derivation of the spirit in a general sense (man) Santayana remarks:

As bounty is the essential character of fatherhood in God, so sonship, or derivativeness, is the essential character of spirit in nature. Only that in nature spirit is scattered and constantly contradicts or forgets its several utterances; whereas in the idea of Christ it is conceived to equal the Father's life in scope and intensity (ICG, 202).

In the derivativeness of man, which is the essential character of spirit in nature, Santayana sees «spirit recognizing its true relation to the universe which gave it birth and of which its organs are a part» (ICG, 201-202).

Considering this, we can understand the correspondence of this chapter to the parallel chapter of the first part, the second chapter, in which treating the origin of the spirit, we found that spirit «in its origin springs from matter» (RS, 49). In other words, this origin of the spirit from matter of the first part is symbolized by the generation of the Son (supreme Spirit) from the Father who, according to Santayana, is a symbolic name for matter or nature.

Now, as the term «begotten» applies to the Son in his relation to

the Father, so (according to the eighth article of the Nicene Creed) the term «procession» applies to the Holy Ghost in its relation to the First Person only (according to the Greek Orthodox Church) or, besides the First, to the Second Person also (according to the *filioque* of the Roman Catholic Church). Of both these terms, which theology posits in the Trinity, Santayana talks as follows in reference to the relation of God to man:

It may be useful to observe that «generation» and «procession», notions that figure in the dogma of the Trinity, are logically equivalent to what we now call «evolution» or «dialectical development»... Now this dialectical relation of «generation» or «procession», which theology posits in the Trinity, polytheism, pantheism and naturalism (when the latter becomes poetical or religious) posit between God and man (ICG, 196).

Considering that Christ is God in man, that is, according to Santayana, «supreme spirit incarnate in a human creature» (RS, 203), we can see how «from the reflection of the Will [the Father] in the Word [the Son] proceeds the Spirit [the Holy Ghost]» (ICG, 65). In this sense, therefore, Christ as a supreme spirit who «pre-existed in heaven [by his generation from the Father]» «would be sent down [by his procession from the Father]» (ICG, 44). He was «sent» into this world by «the Father» (RS, 203), «by the very power by which the world was created» (RS, 207). Of his sending Christ himself says: «This is the will of him that sent me» (ICG, 36).

c. Subordination and Obedience of Christ to His Father (Dependence of Spirit on Matter). The procession or sending of Christ as supreme spirit, besides his generation or derivation, determines also his dependence and subordination on and to the Father so that on this point we can see again the symbolism of the spirit by Christ and, therefore, the correspondence of this chapter to the second chapter (of the first part) where we said that the «spirit depends on matter for its existence» (RS, 79). So, «when we pass to the idea of God as Creator and Father what is dramatized is rather the dependence of spirit upon the vital powers that generate it» (ICG, 252).

In this symbolism «the Father», that is, «the dominant power—call it God, fate, or matter» (ICG, 122) «represents the realm of matter» (RS, 204), «the unfathomable fatherly power on which spirit itself depends» (RS, 206). This dependence, as we said, is a logical consequence of the derivation of the Son from the Father who sent him. «That the Son is

derived from the Father», says Santayana, «is implied by that title, and we begin by proclaiming the dependence of the Son on the Father that sent him» (ICG, 37). He sent him into the world to save everyone who would come to the Father through the Son (ICG, 37), through the faith in Christ (John 3:16) which faith «is obedience of the heart» (ICG, 205). So, «only the souls of individuals could be saved, if they renounced the world, believed in Christ, and learned to live like him in direct dependence on God and communion with him» (ICG, 46), for «we may understand that this world and we in it have independent existence» (ICG, 96). So, «salvation could not consist in pretending to be independent, that is, in becoming mad» (RS, 205).

«The movement of derivation, the essential dependence» (ICG, 63) is what we call also «subordination of the Son to the Father» (ICG, 165) and his obedience to the source from which he derives and on which he depends (ICG, 65-66; also 37). «Christ is the Son of God, and possessed of divine prerogatives; yet, as a son, he is derivative, obedient, not threatening, like so many a king's son, to usurp his father's throne (ICG, 63). He «had been in obedience to the plan laid out for him by his Father» (ICG, 58). «He accepts with an even deeper acceptance the special mission laid upon himself, his humanity, his Passion, his apparent many-sided failure» (ICG, 205). «He is a messenger, sent on a sacrificial mission that he must fulfil obediently, before he can return to the Father, who is greater than he» (ICG, 37). Here is submission of Christ's will to his Father's will. «He has become man that he might be able to suffer this very Passion and drink this very cup» (ICG, 131). «To this economy the spirit [in Christ] submits painfully yet gladly» (RS, 204), for «salvation could not consist in pretending to be independent, that is in becoming mad. It could not consist in correcting the divine economy, and becoming creative, that is, in becoming guilty. Humility, piety, is a prerequisite to spirituality» (RS, 205).

By such a humility is characterized the clear spirit in Christ which «was humble towards universal power, wisely respectful towards the realm of matter (RS, 205). And «not only towards the realm of matter, the universal power on which spirit depends, but also towards the realm of spirit itself, towards all the lives, languages and loves into which spirit can enter» (RS, 205-206). So, the lesson which we learn from the submission or humility of the spirit in Christ, according to Santayana, is this: «Submit; submit even to suffering and death in your innocence, as Christ, who was God himself made man, voluntarily submitted» (ICG, 188); for it is especially in this event of God himself

made man or of the «Word made flesh» that his humility is expressed; it is a humility expressed in God's incarnation, in Christ's birth from an earthly mother. This birth, then, which concerns Christ's relation to his mother we are now going to talk about in the following section.

25. The Birth of Christ (The Earthly Mother of God).

The previous section about the «Generation and Dependence of Christ» concerned his relation to his Father, that is, to God himself who, according to Santayana, is a mythical or symbolic name for the realm of matter. So spirit, as symbolized by Christ, springs in its origin and depends for its existence on matter (RS, 49, 79).

Now, this section about the «Birth of Christ» has to do with his mother, that is, with the Virgin Mary who as we shall see symbolizes the psyche who gives birth to the spirit. So, as the previous section (of this chapter) about the Father of Christ corresponds to the first section of the second chapter of the first part — the section concerning matter as the father of the spirit — so this section about the earthly mother of Christ corresponds also to the second section of the second chapter of the first part, the section concerning the human psyche as the mother of the spirit.

a. The Mother of Christ (Psyche as the Mother of Spirit). As we remember, we talked in that section about psyche, our earthly mother, who gives birth to spirit, the realm of spirit (RM, 162). If this is true, according to our correspondence, the psyche must be symbolized in the birth of Christ by his earthly mother, that is, by the Virgin Mary. In accordance with this symbolism Santayana says the following:

She is the mother of his flesh, of his humility, of his sorrows; and there is something bitter as well as sweet in being bound to her; but he recognizes the bond and its necessity, not only for him but for all life. As he has taught all men to call his Father «Father», so he will teach all men to call his mother «Mother»: that they may learn that nature can be full of grace, and that the flesh can be a parent of the spirit (ICG, 150-151).

And, similarly to the divine Trinity in which the First Person, symbolizing the realm of matter, is the Father of Christ, Santayana finds also a «human Trinity in Calvary» (ICG, 152), constituted by Christ himself, his mother and his beloved disciple who stood by the crose of

Jesus, and «in Mary there is only human nature» «chosen for the incomparable honour of becoming the mother of the incarnate God» (ICG, 151). It is evident, then, that, as the Father in the divine Trinity who generates the Son symbolizes matter which, according to Santayana, is the basis and the origin of the spirit, so Mary, the earthly mother of Christ, as the gateway of his incarnation, symbolizes, on the other hand, the human psyche who gives birth to the spirit.

b. The Expression of Christ's Humility by His Incarnation and Birth (Birth and Rebirth of Spirit). We said that especially in Christ's birth or incarnation, by which God himself was made man, is expressed the humility of Christ, for he came down «in humbler form» (ICG, 48). He expressed his humility by his humanity which was in him «a dire reality» (ICG, 154). In this sense, therefore, «his earthly mother», «is the mother of his flesh, of his humility» (ICG, 150). To this humility of Christ who, being God himself, was made man, Santayana contrasts the pride of Lucifer who wanted to become God. He says:

Incarnante spirit is humble and a little sad, and such as we find it pictured in Christ (RS, 176). In Christ spirit did not need to be saved, it was free initially; yet it was inspired to love and willing to suffer; neither tempted, like the gods of Greece, to become an accomplice to human passions, nor like Lucifer to shut itself up in solitary pride. It was humble towards universal power, wisely respectful towards the realm of matter (RS, 204).

And he concludes that «humility, piety, is a prerequisite to spirituality» (RS, 205). In this sense, therefore, «the good Samaritan is more spiritual than the Pharisee» (RS, 205). In these parables of Christ we can compare the pride of the Pharisee with that of Lucifer and the humility of the good Samaritan with that of Christ himself², for Christ, like the good Samaritan of the parable, «had given in his life and maxims a perfect example of that consecration, humility, chastity, and charity which were the very essence of regeneration» (ICG, 52). So, besides consecration, chastity, and charity, humility is also one of the essential requirements of regeneration.

This regeneration, according to Santayana, is «a change of heart»

2. Christ, however, makes this contrast between pride and humility not in the comparison of the Pharisee (Luke 18:9-14) with the good Samaritan (Luke 10: 29-37), but of the Pharisee with the publican or the tax collector (Gr. *τελώνης*). This is obvious from the conclusion of the parable itself: «Every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted» (Luke 14:14).

(ICG, 52). «There must be a change of heart, a complete new birth of the soul, which baptism symbolized»³. It is «a complete change of spirit», an «esoteric spiritual transformation» (ICG, 45). This new life or new birth is what Kierkegaard characterizes as «to become for *the second time* a child». He says:

To enter into the kingdom of heaven, one must become for a second time a youth. To *be* a child or to *be* a youth when one simply is such is an easy thing; but the *second time* is decisive. To become again a child, to become as nothing, without any selfishness... Yes, that is the task⁴.

In other words, the new birth or the birth for the second time refers to the spirit, it is a spiritual birth; on the other hand, the physical birth or birth for the first time refers mainly to the body. So, there is a parallelism between the birth for the first time and the birth for the second time. For this reason, we treated here, besides the birth of Christ, the birth of the spirit, too. The latter is the birth that Christ brought to everyone who would believe in him, the birth that Christ brought into the world by his own birth.

(To be continued)

3. ICG, 47. Compare these words of Santayana about the new birth of the soul, which baptism symbolizes, with those of Christ in his discussion with Nicodemus (John 3:1-21). «Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God» (John 3:5).

4. Kierkegaard, *Training in Christianity*, tr. by Walter Lowrie, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1944, p. 190. Compare with Matthew 18:3.